

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2002/10/21 : CIA-RDP67B00820R000300090016-7

STATINTL

STATINTL

March 28, 1960

STATINTL

ITEK Corporation
Crescent Street
Waltham 54, Massachusetts

STATINTL

Dear

STATINTL

Confirming our telephone conversation regarding the Accounting Machine, I am enclosing the price and specifications.

STATINTL

- Monthly Rental: M. F. E. T.

STAT

Model A-1

120	Type Wheels
112	Counter Positions
16	5-Position Co-Selectors
15	2-Position Pilot Selectors
	2 Digit Selectors
	10 Filters

.093 Type Size

There are several different printing arrangements available. The most common is Arrangement A. However, for writing scientific programs Printing Arrangement F is normally used. There is a \$480 charge for changing arrangements in the field.

We will be glad to discuss with you these printing choices and answer any questions you may have concerning the other specifications of your IBM 407.

Very truly yours,

STATINTL

Sales Representative

CEK:ff

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2002/10/21 : CIA-RDP67B00820R000300090016-7

Approved For Release 2002/10/21 : CIA-RDP67B00820R000300090016-7

3 Feb 60

SUBJECT: Procurement of 10 Mensuration Viewers for the Air Force, Sequence of Events

1. On or about the first week of August 1959, [REDACTED] of the DPD-DD/P was advised by Mr. R. Neasham, PIC, and Major C. Sykes, AFCIG, Air Force, that the Air Force had a requirement for 10 Mensuration Viewers similar to the two DD/P had on procurement with ITEK for PIC and the Army. In keeping with Joint Procurement Program for the Community, Mr. R. Neasham and Major Sykes were advised that this requirement could be added on the existing Contract with ITEK.

STAT

2. Shortly thereafter, a thermofax copy of a proposal to a [REDACTED] was forwarded to DPD by Lt.Col. Kemp, AFCIN. The second page of this proposal was missing. In addition to 10 Viewers, the Contractor had proposed a training program, program services and other services.

STAT

3. On 26 August 1959 [REDACTED] visited the ITEK Facility to discuss the proposal with the Contractor in more detail. As a result of these discussions the Contractor was requested to submit a revised proposal to DPD.

STAT

4. On 16 September this revised proposal was received. Copies were forwarded to PIC on 22 September by Memo which pointed out several things the most important of which were as follows:

- a. No funds had been received to date.
- b. No authorization to proceed had been received by the Contracting Officer.

c. Technical approval of the "Advance Version" of the viewer was necessary.

BB-375
PropSec

- d. Request for a meeting between PIC, Air Force and DPD Representatives to iron out procedures and approval of proposal.
- e. Advised that DPD was not proceeding with procurement until above was accomplished.

5. Subsequent to the above, several telephone discussions were held between [] of DPD and Major Sykes and/or Lt. Col. Kemp of USAF regarding the use of Air Force funds presently on "deposit" with DPD for CHALICE and other requirements. No objection was imposed by DPD provided approval was given by []

6. On 3 November the DPD was advised that USAF had located funds. A request for transfer was initiated on this date and a Program Approval was submitted to the Director, CIA, for approval to procure. The funds arrived on 18 November and the Director also signed the Program Approval on this date.

7. On or about 10 November, [] was advised by Mr. Neasham that Major Anderson and Lt. Col. McCash of SAC and representatives from ITEK and AFCIN were to meet at PIC on 17 November, as requested above.

8. On 17 November the meeting was held at PIC. However, the SAC Representatives were unaware of the reason for such a meeting. As far as they knew the requirement had not been approved by USAF. Advised that USAF had approved and funds were being transferred, SAC approved the go ahead on the 1st five Viewers. They requested no go ahead be given for the five "Advanced" versions of the Viewer until they had seen the technical proposal and performance specifications. There was some question if these viewers would even be required unless there was sufficient advancement in the capability over the other

viewer. ITEK was requested to prepare such information. On 28 December this information was received from ITEK and immediately forwarded to SAC thru AFCIN.

9. On 23 November a Letter Contract was mailed to ITEK authorizing them to proceed with the five viewers.

10. On 12-13 January representatives of SAC, AFCIN, PIC and ITEK met to discuss the technical aspects of the proposal. DPD was informed that SAC now desired a study of their RTS and PI Techniques prior to procurement release of the 5 "Advanced" Viewers.

11. On 18 January a copy of SAC's letter to AFCIN which set forth SAC's desired statement of work and requirements was furnished by Mr. Neasham to DPD. Certain objections were immediately raised regarding deviation to Agency security requirements proposed by SAC. Mr.

STAT called Major Biely of AFCIN and requested they get together on the proposal. Major Biely agreed, however, he stated that SAC's letter together with a complete picture of the Air Force part in the Joint Procurement was being set up thru Col. Fisher to General Walsh for approval. He felt that after approval of the Program had been granted we should all get together.

STAT 12. On 1 February called Major Sykes of AFCIC and asked him to check on status of program.